



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10/650,538 | 08/28/2003 | Gary A. Diehl | ROC920030133US1 | 9039 |
| 7590 | 08/23/2007 | | EXAMINER | |
| Grant A. Johnson IBM Corporation-Dept. 917 3605 Highway 52 North Rochester, MN 55901 | | | CHRISTENSEN, SCOTT B | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2144 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/23/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/650,538 | DIEHL ET AL. |
| | Examiner Scott Christensen | Art Unit 2144 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 7-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in regards to the most recent papers filed on 6/8/2007.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/8/2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 8, and 13 objected to because of the following informalities:
Each of claims 1, 8, and 13 includes "responsive to failure of said selected proxy agent; dynamically selecting a new proxy agent **is for** said Virutal Internet protocol..."
First, the semi-colon should apparently be a comma, as the step of dynamically selecting is part of the same step as "responsive to failure..."
Second, the text "is for" should apparently read "for."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With regard to claim 13, the instant claim has been amended to limit a computer-readable medium to consisting one of a floppy disk, an optically read compact disk, a compact disk read only memory (CD-ROM), a tape, a read only memory (ROM), and a random access memory (RAM). However, the discussion of computer readable medium in the specification on page 7, lines 29-31 does not include ROM or RAM within the disclosure of the computer readable medium. Applicant should either amend the claim to include only elements listed under recording media in the cited portion of the specification (or explicitly stated as being types of computer readable media that can store the computer program product), or amend the claim to read:

"A computer recording medium storing a computer program product for implementing enhanced proxy Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) for Virtual Internet protocol (IP) addresses in a server computer, said computer program product including instructions that, when executed by the processor, cause the server to perform the steps of:"

"Computer recordable medium" has antecedent bases within the specification on page 7, lines 29-31, and would include only recordable type computer readable media, including, but not limited to, the examples cited in the instant passage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4 and 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in US Patent number 7,088,689 B2, hereafter referred to as "Lee" in view of Kirchner et al in US Patent number 6,263,370 B1, hereafter referred to as "Kirchner," and Smyk in US Patent number 6,289,001 B1, hereafter referred to as "Smyk."

With regard to claim 1, Lee discloses a method for implementing proxy Address Resolution for Virtual Internet Protocol addresses comprising identifying a Virtual Internet Protocol interface requiring proxy ARP (Lee: Column 2, lines 19-26. If data is transferred between two VLANs (VLANs have virtual IP addresses associated with the nodes), then a Virtual Internet Protocol interface requiring proxy ARP is identified), dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual Internet Protocol interface (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-54), adding an IP address for said Virtual Internet Protocol interface to an address list of an associated physical adapter for said selected proxy agent (Lee:

Column 3, lines 34-41), and utilizing said associated physical adapter for said selected proxy agent and broadcasting said added IP address for said Virtual Internet Protocol interface with a media access control address of said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-53. The ARP request packet contains both the IP address, which is a Virtual IP address in this case, and the MAC address. This packet is broadcast to all nodes in the local subnet.).

Lee does not disclose expressly that the proxy agent and Virtual Internet protocol interface are in a same subnet. Lee also does not disclose expressly that responsive to failure of said selected proxy agent, dynamically selecting a new proxy agent is for said Virtual Internet protocol interface by TCP/IP code. Lee also does not disclose expressly the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes providing TCP/IP code for dynamically selecting said proxy agent.

It is noted that subnet is not explicitly defined in the applicant's specification. Subnet could conceivably have two definitions.

First, a subnet is a subset of any network.

Second, a subnet is a subnet as defined by RFC 917, "Internet Standard Subnetting Procedure," by Jeffrey Mogul in October of 1984, hereafter referred to as "RFC917."

Using the first definition, the proxy agent and Virtual Internet protocol interface are in the same subnet in the disclosure of Lee (Lee: Figure 2. As a subnet is a subset of any network, a subset may encompass the whole network, or a portion of the

network. Even if Figure 2 shows the entire network, it can still constitute a subnet according to the first definition.).

Using the second definition, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to have the proxy agent and Virtual Internet protocol interface in the same subnet.

Evidence of this can be found in RFC917. RFC917 discloses that a subnet is a logically visible sub-section of a single Internet network. This allows an organization to have a single connection to the Internet with one IP address for their entire network (RFC917: Page 1, Overview). When applied to Lee, all the components in the invention of Lee would be in the same subnet, as a single organization would likely be implementing the invention within their network.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the proxy agent and Virtual Internet protocol interface in the same subnet.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that organizations using subnets can use one number for several networks (RFC917: Overview). By implementing Lee's system on a single subnet, the nodes of the network would have a more direct communication line with each other, but still have access to the Internet.

Kirchner discloses using a TCP/IP interface for a client-server interface, where the server acts as a proxy (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43). If TCP/IP were used with Lee, any selection would involve code written to conform to the TCP/IP standard.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TCP/IP of Kirchner with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that TCP/IP was a very well known protocol, used in many networks and the Internet. By using TCP/IP, the proxy Address Resolution protocol would be compatible with more networks.

Smyk discloses a proxy agent selector that identifies alternate proxy agents should one or more of the other proxy agents fail and selects one or more alternate proxy agents (Smyk: Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proxy selector of Smyk with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee as modified by Kirchner.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow proxy signaling to continue undisturbed in case of a failure (Smyk: Abstract).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the instant claim does not require that only the subnet is checked for a proxy agent. Therefore, a method that searches both in the same subnet and outside the subnet would meet this claim limitation. It is noted that Lee does not explicitly state that the subnet that the interface resides in is not searched. By checking within the same subnet, a proxy agent that is closer to the interface could possibly be found, thereby reducing the overall delay in communications and the burden on the network as a whole.

With regard to claim 2, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches identifying a broadcast ARP response for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Abstract. The term "input/output processor response handler task" seems to simply identify the means that are utilized to identify a broadcast ARP response. Also, since a response occurs, it must have been identified), and continuing activation for said Virtual Internet protocol interface including enqueueing said Virtual Internet protocol interface to a proxy list of said selected proxy agents (Lee: Column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 12).

With regard to claim 3, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches setting an associated local IP address of said selected proxy agent in said Virtual Internet protocol interface (This limitation is inherently present. The agent needs to have a local IP address in order to receive any packets, so the address must be set. "To complete activation for said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface," as recited in claim 15, is interpreted as intended use, and is not given weight).

With regard to claim 4, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes providing TCP/IP code for dynamically selecting said proxy agent (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43. When Kirchner is combined with Lee, as in the rejection of claim 1 above, the communications would be performed through TCP/IP, meaning code

involving TCP/IP would be utilized to find and assign the proxy agent. Thus, TCP/IP code is provided for dynamically selecting said proxy agent.).

With regard to claim 7, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes answering ARP requests for Virtual Internet protocol addresses (Lee: Abstract) with Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol code for said selected proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43. As the combination of references as applied to claim 1 above uses TCP/IP, any response to a message would involve TCP/IP messages, which would be in a code conforming to TCP/IP.).

With regard to claim 8, Lee discloses an apparatus for implementing proxy Address Resolution Protocol for Virtual Internet protocol addresses comprising a local network (Lee: Fig. 2, VLAN 1 and VLAN 2. Virtual Local Area Networks are interpreted as being similar to the local network as specified in the claim), a server computer having a Virtual Internet protocol code for dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-54), code for dynamically selecting a proxy agent for said Virtual internet protocol interface (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-54), and a proxy ARP (Lee: Abstract) for Virtual AP interface initiation task for adding an IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol interface to an address list of an associated one of said physical adapters for said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 3, lines 34-41)

and for utilizing said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent for broadcasting said added IP address for said Virtual Internet protocol interface with a media access control address of said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 2, lines 45-53. The ARP request packet contains both the IP address, which is a Virtual IP address in this case, and the MAC address. This packet is broadcast to all nodes in the local subnet.).

Lee does not disclose expressly that the code for selecting a proxy agent is within the TCP/IP standard. Lee also does not disclose expressly that responsive to failure of said selected proxy agent, dynamically selecting a new proxy agent is for said Virtual Internet protocol interface by TCP/IP code. Lee also does not disclose expressly the step of dynamically selecting said proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface includes providing TCP/IP code for dynamically selecting said proxy agent.

Kirchner discloses using a TCP/IP interface for a client-server interface, where the server acts as a proxy (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TCP/IP of Kirchner with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that TCP/IP was a very well known protocol, used in many networks and the Internet. By using TCP/IP, the proxy Address Resolution protocol would be compatible with more networks.

Kirchner discloses using a TCP/IP interface for a client-server interface, where the server acts as a proxy (Kirchner: Column 10, lines 22-43). If TCP/IP were used with Lee, any selection would involve code written to conform to the TCP/IP standard.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine TCP/IP of Kirchner with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that TCP/IP was a very well known protocol, used in many networks and the Internet. By using TCP/IP, the proxy Address Resolution protocol would be compatible with more networks.

Smyk discloses a proxy agent selector that identifies alternate proxy agents should one or more of the other proxy agents fail and selects one or more alternate proxy agents (Smyk: Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proxy selector of Smyk with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee as modified by Kirchner.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow proxy signaling to continue undisturbed in case of a failure (Smyk: Abstract).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to check for a proxy agent in the same subnet as said Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that the instant claim does not require that only the subnet is checked for a proxy agent. Therefore, a method that searches both in the same subnet and outside the subnet would meet this claim limitation. It is noted that Lee does not explicitly state that the subnet that the interface resides in is not searched. By checking within the same subnet, a proxy agent that is

closer to the interface could possibly be found, thereby reducing the overall delay in communications and the burden on the network as a whole.

With regard to claim 9, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches the invention as substantially claimed except that the TCP/IP code is responsive to a failure of said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent, for dynamically selecting a new proxy agent for said Virtual Internet protocol interface.

Smyk discloses a proxy agent selector that identifies alternate proxy agents should one or more of the other proxy agents fail and selects one or more alternate proxy agents (Smyk: Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the proxy selector of Smyk with the proxy Address Resolution Protocol of Lee as modified by Kirchner.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow proxy signaling to continue undisturbed in case of a failure (Smyk: Abstract).

With regard to claim 10, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the TCP/IP code answers ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Abstract), said ARP requests being provided without a parameter defining an associated local interface being specified with said ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Column 4, lines 13-26. The virtual ARP request does not identify

the local interface that the ARP request is actually for, but rather identifies the proxy ARP server.).

With regard to claim 11, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches an input/output processor response handler task for identifying a broadcast ARP response for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Abstract. The term "input/output processor response handler task" seems to simply identify the means that are utilized to identify a broadcast ARP response. Also, since a response occurs, it must have been identified), and for continuing activation for said Virtual Internet protocol interface including enqueueing said Virtual Internet protocol interface to a proxy list of said selected proxy agent (Lee: Column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 12).

With regard to claim 12, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the IOP response handler task is adapted for setting an associated local IP address of said selected proxy agent in said Virtual Internet protocol interface to complete activation for said Virtual Internet protocol interface (Lee: Column 3, lines 34 to 47. As the IP address is stored in the memory, the IP address associated with the given MAC address was set, at least in the memory. When the memory is set with the IP address, for all purposes, activation of the Virtual IP interface is completed, at least with respect to the server).

With regard to claims 13-17, the invention claimed is substantially similar to that claimed in claims 1-4 and 9, respectively, and are rejected for substantially similar reasons.

With regard to claim 18, Lee as modified by Kirchner and Smyk teaches that the TCP/IP code (Since the code running the program is written to utilize TCP/IP, it is interpreted as being TCP/IP code) utilizes said physical adapter for said selected proxy agent for answering ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Abstract. As the proxy ARP server (or agent) sends a packet in response to receiving the ARP request packet, the response must utilize the physical adapter of the agent in order to reach the network.), said ARP requests being provided without a parameter defining an associated local interface being specified with said ARP requests to said Virtual Internet protocol address (Lee: Column 4, lines 13-26. The virtual ARP request does not identify the local interface that the ARP request is actually for, but rather identifies the proxy ARP server.).

Response to Arguments

Rejections under 35 USC 101

Applicant's amendments to claims 13-18 have overcome the applied rejection under 35 USC 101, as the computer-readable medium is now limited to one of a floppy disk, an optically read compact disk, a compact disk read only memory (CD-ROM), a tape, a read only memory (ROM), and a random access memory (RAM).

Rejections under 35 USC 103

Applicant's arguments with regard to the applied rejections under 35 USC 103 have been carefully considered, but have been deemed nonpersuasive.

First, it is noted that Applicant has amended each independent claim with the subject matter presented in claims 5 and 6, which are now cancelled. However, Applicant's remarks do not include any arguments with respect to the subject matter presented in claims 5 and 6. Thus, for details of Examiner's reasoning with respect to this subject matter, refer to the rejections under 35 USC 103 above of claims 1, 8, and 13.

Second, it is noted that on page 15, Applicant states, "As defined in the IBM Dictionary of Computing, a subnet in TCP/IP is a part of a network that is identified by a portion of the Internet address. The address to all nodes in a subnet starts with the same binary sequence." It is noted that no statement was made that this was the intended meaning of the term "subnet" as used in the application, nor has any portion of the specification been cited that demonstrates that this is the controlling definition of "subnet" within the application. Further, it is noted that subnet as described in RFC917 is consistent with this definition of subnet. However, for the reasoning stated, the other interpretation of subnet, as in the rejection under 35 USC 103 of claim 1, has been maintained.

On pages 16-17, Applicant argues that "Lee does not show or suggest identifying a Virtual Internet protocol (IP) interface requiring proxy ARP, as taught and claimed by applicants. It is noted, however, that Applicant's further remarks with respect to this argument seems to rely solely on the disclosure of the specification, not on the limitations within the claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In the paragraph joining pages 17-18 of Applicant's remarks, Applicant generally alleges that certain features are not taught or suggested by Lee. However, specific arguments have not been presented with how the features are not taught by Lee when combined with Kirchner, Smyk, and knowledge possessed by a person of ordinary skill in the art. Upon review of the applied rejection, Examiner disagrees for at least the reasons in the rejection of the instant claims under 35 USC 103.

The remaining arguments presented on pages 18-21 of Applicant's remarks appear to be similar to the arguments presented on pages 16-17 and in the paragraph joining pages 17-18, as discussed above, in that either the Applicant provides general allegations that the claimed features are not present in the teachings of the references, without specific arguments or evidence to the contrary or that Applicant relies on subject

matter within the specification, but not within the claims. Therefore, the remaining arguments will not be discussed further.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Christensen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1144. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vaughn William can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SBC


WILLIAM VAUGHN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100